


REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 remains in this application and stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopp in view of Ooitsu et al. It is respectfully submitted that there is no reason to combine Kopp and Ooitsu for several reasons. First of all, the use of the cited material in Ooitsu at col. 9, lines 50-60 refers to its use as a bearing cage rather than a bearing itself. More importantly, Ooitsu does not disclose a particular environment for use of the bearing shown. The fast set materials for Applicants' invention are notoriously abrasive and hard on materials and one skilled in the art would want to choose a material known to work with such. The only suggestion to do so is found in Applicants' disclosure. As set forth at lines 14-19 of page 1 of the specification, the advantages of the claimed material are substantial in that it "provides at least twice the life with ½ the wear of currently marketed mix modules." In fact, that statement understates actual experience which has shown life improvement of up to ten times over the common prior art acetal resin engineering plastic (often sold under the trademark DELRIN) mix modules. That unexpected result in life improvement was set forth in the previously submitted declaration of Applicant Weinberger. Accordingly, it is submitted that it would not be obvious to utilize the claimed material in the device of Kopp given the results obtained.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas B. Farrow

Registration No. 28582

Graco Inc.

Appl.No. 10/551,915
Amdt.dated August 8, 2007
Reply to Office action of May 8, 2007

PO Box 1441

Minneapolis, MN 55440

(612) 623-6769

legal@graco.com